Manager
WFMD
Frederick, Md. 21701

1/10/89

Dear Sir,

First, please excuse my typing. I'm 76, in impaired health, and must sit with my legs elevated. This means the typewriter is not directly in front of me.

After noticing some of the letters complaining about the Limbaugh show you air I listened to it yesterday. I was dismayed, shocked and then disgusted. Some of these emotions were directed at you and your station.

Years ago, in connection with my writing, I did most of the then popular talk shows from coast to coast, radio and TV. I know the commercial value of controversy and of angering some of the audience and pleasing others, ~~in it~~. There were some pretty wild and irresponsible shows then but I recall nothing as absolutely terrible as this one and Limbaugh personally.

He is a man who has made an art of ignorance and stupidity and a science of dissembling, dishonesty and outright lying. He preaches hate and along with him you commercialize the hate he preaches.

I was so outraged I turned you off. Then I turned the radio on again to get the news and could hardly believe what he said. He was ranting and raving about environmentalists and the current controversy over the destruction of the tropical rain forests. He never once got around to what the problems are or the controversies relate to. Of course all the conservative environmentalists are his bete noir, liberals. Anything he doesn't like or thinks can get attention he condemns as liberal. He hasn't the slightest notion of what a liberal is or whether issues are liberal or not. But in the flaunting of his ignorance and his effort to belittle this very real problem he described the extent of land that was being deforested as of eight square miles, an area he repeated several times. He then said that he had an atlas or similar book in front of him and said that it showed Los Angeles is eight square miles! That display of ignorance is what got me to turn you off. After the news he said he was broadcasting from Los Angeles. And how so little notion of its actual extent? Frederick, a small city, is much larger than eight square miles. My point here is that he is ignorant, misleads and misinforms and is indifferent to it.

To a large degree your audience depends on you for information. Ours is a society that works by people expressing their views, interest and desires. And of all the things you can air you air this rotten stuff? You care so little for the area in which you profit from owning and operating a station you mislead and misinform those who make your prosperity possible? You care so little about the area in which we live that to make a few dollars you would persaude your audience to act and vote against what is to their, your and the area's interest, like environmental concerns? They are quite real here, if you have not thought about it, and they are growing more serious.

In airing this kind of really rotten stuff just because you find it profitable you reflect contempt for your audience and for the area that enables you to profit from it. This is what disgusted me so, more than that horrible creature Limbaugh; you can be so entirely without regard for your audience and this area and so contemptuous of their and its interest. You shame yourselves and earn what I think will happen, that those of us who understand the harm the Limbaughs of the world do, will just stop spending our money with those who advertise on your station. I don't know of anything else we can do and be responsible citizens, people who care about each other and the area in which we live. There are so many places we can spend our money we don't have to spend it in a way that can further the evil Limbaugh is and represents.

If you continue to air him I'll certainly practise this and will encourage all those I know to engage in the same boycott. Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

Harold

Before I could read and correct this letter the mail came. In it, appropriately, I believe, was the current issue of a publication by some of our most respected, retired military leaders, men deeply concerned about our actual defense needs. Please look at the last page first because it identifies them and their staff and advisers. Rather than these environmentalists - and it is environmentalists about whom Limbaugh was deceiving and misleading your audience - being some kind of farout, bleeding-heart liberals they are authentic conservatives. I can identify only three of the nonmilitary names as of people who can be called liberals. One is a well-known actor, another the former editor of The Saturday Review and the third an eminent scholar in military and peqce matters.

I hope you will take time to read the entire issue not only because concerns about the environment are valid and serious but to give you an independent and authoritative means of evaluating my criticisms of Limbaugh and the station for airing him when he is either so ignorant or so dishonest and so stupid and unfactual in his political views.

To describe Limbaugh and what you are doing in airing him as merely indecent and hurtful to the area is to praise him, he is that terribly, terribly bad. Really evil. For a buck! Which makes it and airing him even more disgraceful!